

**SPOKEN REMARKS OF MONICA M. GOODLING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON
THE JUDICIARY, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**PURSUANT TO THE COMMITTEE'S SUBPOENA AND THE DISTRICT COURT'S
ORDER OF IMMUNITY**

May 23, 2007

Good morning Chairman Conyers, Ranking Member Smith, and Members of the Committee. Thank you for allowing me to make this statement. With the Committee's permission, I will submit lengthier written remarks to be entered into the record.

My written remarks address four topics that I expect will be of interest to the Committee.

First, I wish to set the record straight regarding what I understand to be the Deputy Attorney General's allegation to Senator Schumer that I withheld information from him prior to his public and private testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

That allegation is false. I did not withhold information from the Deputy. To the contrary, I worked diligently to compile and provide the Deputy with dozens of pages of statistics and other information that I thought he was likely to need based on the questions being asked at that time.

Despite my and others' best efforts, the Deputy's public testimony was incomplete or inaccurate in a number of respects. As explained in more detail in my written remarks, I believe that the Deputy was not fully candid about his knowledge of White House involvement in the replacement decision, failed to disclose that he had some knowledge of the White House's interest in selecting Tim Griffin as the Interim U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas, inaccurately described the Department's internal assessment of the Parsky Commission, and failed to disclose that he had some knowledge of allegations that Tim Griffin had been involved in vote "caging" during his work on the President's 2004 campaign.

After the Deputy's public testimony, I continued to work to assemble information that the Deputy had promised to provide in a future private session. On February 14, 2007, the Deputy attended a private briefing with the Senate Judiciary Committee. That afternoon, I rode with the Deputy to the Senate building, intending to observe the session and support the Deputy by providing any information that I had. However, a few minutes before the private Senate briefing was to take place, the Deputy made it clear to me that he did not think I should attend. The Deputy suggested that if someone recognized me as the White House Liaison, the Members would be more likely to ask questions about the White House. As a result of that conversation, I waited outside the room while the Deputy briefed the Senate committee. During a break, Richard Hertling told me that the briefing was not going well and recommended that I return to the Department immediately. Like the Deputy, Mr. Hertling suggested that it could complicate matters if anyone recognized me as the White House Liaison. As a result, I returned to the Department in a taxi.

In light of these events, I was surprised to learn that the Deputy had blamed me for the incomplete or inaccurate information he provided to the Senate.

Second, I wish to clarify my role as White House Liaison.

Despite that title, I did not hold "the keys to the Kingdom," as some have suggested. I was not the primary White House contact for purposes of the development or approval of the U.S. Attorney replacement plan. I have never attended a meeting of the White House Judicial Selection Committee. Kyle Sampson and the Attorney General attended these meetings. To the best of my recollection, I never had a conversation with Karl Rove or Harriet Miers while I served at the Department. I am certain that I never spoke to either of them about the hiring or firing of any U.S. Attorney. Although I did have discussions with certain members of their staffs regarding specific aspects of the replacement plan, I never recommended to them that a specific U.S. Attorney be added to or removed from Mr. Sampson's list, and I do not recall that they ever communicated any such recommendation to me.

Third, I wish to address my role in selecting U.S. Attorneys for replacement.

I first learned that others more senior to me were discussing the possibility of replacing some U.S. Attorneys at some point in mid-2005, and I believe I first saw a list of candidates for replacement in January 2006 when Mr. Sampson showed me a draft memorandum he was preparing for Harriet Miers. At that time, I recommended that two of the U.S. Attorneys Mr. Sampson had listed be retained in office, and that certain other U.S. Attorneys be considered for replacement. Paul Charlton and Daniel Bogden were two of the U.S. Attorneys that I recommended considering for replacement. However, it appears from the documents produced to Congress by the Department that Mr. Sampson did not initially accept my recommendation. Mr. Bogden and Mr. Charlton did not appear on iterations of the list sent to the White House in January, April, and May, and first appeared on the list in September 2006, presumably for reasons unrelated to my initial recommendation.

Although I am prepared to tell this Committee what I knew about the eight replaced U.S. Attorneys, the truth is that I do not know why Kevin Ryan, John McKay, Carol Lam, Paul Charlton, Daniel Bogden, David Iglesias, and Margaret Chiara were asked to resign in December 2006. I can describe what I and others discussed as the reasons for their removal, but I cannot guarantee that these reasons are the same as those contemplated by the final decision makers who requested the resignations of these U.S. Attorneys. However, I am not aware of anyone within the Department ever suggesting the replacement of these U.S. Attorneys to interfere with a particular case or in retaliation for prosecuting or refusing to prosecute a particular case for political advantage.

Fourth, I wish to clarify my role in career hiring at the Department.

During my five years at the Department, I believe I interviewed hundreds of job applicants. The vast majority of these were applicants for political appointee positions, but some were applicants for a few categories of career positions. Specifically, I interviewed candidates who were to be detailed into confidential, policy-making positions and Attorney General appointments, such as Immigration Judges and Members of the Board of Immigration Appeals. I

also reviewed requests for waivers of hiring freezes imposed on districts with an outgoing U.S. Attorney or an Interim or Acting U.S. Attorney.

In every case, I tried to act in good faith and for the purpose of ensuring that the Department was staffed by well-qualified individuals who were supportive of the Attorney General's views, priorities, and goals. Nevertheless, I do acknowledge that I may have gone too far in asking political questions of applicants for career positions, and may have taken inappropriate political considerations into account on some occasions. I regret these mistakes.

In conclusion, I would like to give the Committee a better sense of who I am. The person that I read about on the internet and in the newspaper is not me.

At heart, I am a fairly quiet girl who tries to do the right thing and tries to treat people kindly along the way. I always knew I wanted to grow up and do something to serve or help other people. I went to public schools growing up but chose Christian universities, in part, because of the value they placed on service.

I've seen in my life what violent crime can do to its victims and I knew that at some point I wanted to do my part to seek justice on their behalf. That's why I loved the Department of Justice, particularly my time as a prosecutor. For the five years that I spent there, I worked as hard as I could at whatever task was put before me – and I hope that's the reason why I was promoted five times during my service in the Department.

I considered the people that I worked with to be my family and I care about them deeply. I have no desire to say anything negative about anyone that I worked with, including the leadership team or the U.S. Attorneys who are the subject of my testimony. However, I am here to be a fact witness to what I heard, saw, did, or know and I'll do that to the best of my recollection.

Thank you for allowing me to make this statement. I am prepared to answer your questions.